

University of Groningen

## In search of Hungary in Europe

Teszelszky, Kees

*Published in:*  
A Divided Hungary in Europe

**IMPORTANT NOTE:** You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

*Document Version*  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

*Publication date:*  
2014

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Teszelszky, K. (2014). In search of Hungary in Europe: an Introduction. In K. Teszelszky (Ed.), *A Divided Hungary in Europe : Exchanges, Networks and Representations, 1541-1699. Volume 3: The Making and Uses of the Image of Hungary and Transylvania* (Vol. 3, pp. 1-15). (A Divided Hungary in Europe: Exchanges, Networks and Representations, 1541-1699 ). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.  
<http://www.cambridgescholars.com/download/sample/61956>

**Copyright**

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

**Take-down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

*Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.*

# IN SEARCH OF HUNGARY IN EUROPE: AN INTRODUCTION

## KEES TESZELSZKY

This volume investigates how the exchange of knowledge and information influenced the development of the early modern image of divided Hungary in Europe. Divided Hungary must be understood as the composition of political communities which existed on the territory of the former medieval Kingdom of Hungary (which included Croatia and Transylvania) between 1541 and 1699.<sup>1</sup> However, the making of this image was not just a *by-product* of cultural exchange in Europe; it was a “product” extensively used and negotiated in the developing “public sphere.”<sup>2</sup> Treated as information, news or the subject of public opinion, the image was utilized in the political communication in different European states to legitimate certain goals or to convince the audience of the rightness of a specific message.<sup>3</sup>

To understand the making and uses of this image, the authors of this volume focus on the diplomatic, intellectual and commercial networks of Europe, especially in the Holy Roman Empire (see the chapters by Etényi and Lénárt) and Italy (Kruppa). They also devote attention to the emerging

---

<sup>1</sup> For an overview of the history of divided Hungary between 1541 and 1699 in the English language, see: Á. R. Várkonyi, *Europica Varietas, Hungarica Varietas, 1526–1762: Selected Studies*, trans. by É. Pálmai et al. (Budapest 2000); G. Murdock, *Calvinism on the Frontier: International Calvinism and the Reformed Church of Hungary and Transylvania, c. 1600–1660* (Oxford 2000); G. Pálffy, *The Kingdom of Hungary and the Habsburg Monarchy in the Sixteenth Century*, trans. by T. J. DeKornfeld and H. D. DeKornfeld (Boulder, CO. 2009); *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, ed. by G. Kármán and L. Kunčević (Leiden 2013).

<sup>2</sup> On the concept of public sphere, cf. J. Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. by T. Burger and F. Lawrence (Cambridge 1989), 51–56.

<sup>3</sup> On news, information and public opinion in the sixteenth century, cf. B. Dooley, *A Social History of Skepticism: Experience and Doubt in Early Modern Culture* (Baltimore 1999).

power of the sixteenth century, the Dutch Republic (Réthelyi and Teszelszky), and the perspective from the eastern part of Europe, specifically Poland-Lithuania (Brzeziński), Croatia (Kurelac), and Moldavia and Wallachia (Jakó).

The essays of this volume raise questions about the ways in which representation and propaganda concerning divided Hungary developed and the image of Hungary and the Hungarians was constructed. In particular, it is asked how the transmission of information influenced the textual and visual image of Hungary presented in contemporary printed and manuscript sources, and what relevant information exchange may reveal about the transformation of the early modern political culture in Europe. Finally, the authors also devote their attention to the question of how Hungary's image related to the development of a broader idea of Europe and the inclusion or exclusion of the Ottoman Empire.

To answer these questions, the authors of the volume necessarily rely on a multidisciplinary approach to European diplomacy and intellectual history, with special attention to the developing and intensifying political, commercial and cultural ties of the smaller powers. They also study the representation of these smaller powers in the printed and handwritten news in Europe, when some of them were at the height of their influence in European affairs.

### *Imagology*

The studies in this book aim to contribute to our knowledge of the many ways the image of a divided Hungary and the Hungarians was created, spread, used and reused in Europe during the early modern period. The starting point of our analysis will be that the representation has never been a static one. An "image" can be considered as a snapshot of an ongoing dynamic process, in which a political and geographical entity, and the people which are associated with it, are mirrored in literature and art. The Dutch imagologist Joep Leerssen adequately describes this process with the metaphor "mirror palace of Europe."<sup>4</sup> The image of Hungary, constructed from specific individual elements which appear in various historical sources, can be known through a careful study of the many reflections of it in European culture.

---

<sup>4</sup> J. Leerssen, *Spiegelpaleis Europa: Europese cultuur als mythe en beeldvorming* [Mirror palace Europe: European culture as myth and formation of representation] (Nijmegen 2011).

According to the definition of Leerssen, imagology is “the study of an intellectual discourse on national characteristics and commonplaces.”<sup>5</sup> Yet, it is not so much the empirical research into the knowledge of objective characteristics or the distribution of facts but much more the study of the use of commonplaces and the spread of hearsay. Commonplaces related to countries and peoples are often based on, or related to, age-old myths and fictions. Imagological discourses are spiced by human emotions, which are stirred up by the political or religious questions of the day. The imagined reality is also related to real life since images can affect political decisions. While the sources are rhetorically schematized, they are also essentially subjective. Thus the image we attempt to study is, as such, the ideological mirror of an intellectual discourse.<sup>6</sup>

Another, perhaps more precise, definition of Manfred Beller states that imagology examines the origin and function of the characteristics of other countries and people as expressed textually and visually.<sup>7</sup> Accordingly, it is the rhetorical use of *topoi* which becomes the carrier of stereotyped information of other people and social groups.

### *Imagology, national identity and Europe*

As Peter Rietbergen has claimed, it is only when self-definition is necessary that people become self-reflective and describe their own identity with regard to the outside world.<sup>8</sup> In a sense, the early modern development of the image of divided Hungary and the Hungarians went hand in hand with the evolution of national identities in Europe. The way in which people, especially the elites, began to consider themselves as an autonomous political community and at the same time as a part of some greater unity has much to do with how they perceived the “other.” Similarly as with national identity, the image of the “other” is a cultural construction based on well-known ancient and/or recently invented stereotypes, created with a specific ideological goal in mind. The concept of the Kingdom of

---

<sup>5</sup> J. Leerssen, “Foreword,” in *Imagology: The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters: A Critical Survey*, ed. by M. Beller and J. Leerssen (Amsterdam 2007), xiii.

<sup>6</sup> B. Trencsényi and M. Zászkaliczky, “Towards an Intellectual History of Patriotism in East Central Europe in the Early Modern Period,” in *Whose Love of Which Country? Composite States, National Histories and Patriotic Discourses in Early Modern East Central Europe*, ed. by B. Trencsényi and M. Zászkaliczky (Leiden 2010), 1–40.

<sup>7</sup> M. Beller, “Perception, Image, Imagology,” in *Imagology*, 3–16.

<sup>8</sup> P. Rietbergen, *Europe: A Cultural History* (London 1998, repr. 2005), 210–211.

Hungary and Hungarians was thus expressed metaphorically in words and images. It was a reflection of intellectual thoughts or positive/negative emotions regarding this land and its peoples. Especially in times of political, religious, economic or social crisis, or confrontations like war, revolt or religious persecution, people felt the need to gather information on this concept, reflect on it and spread the newly constructed image based on these thoughts and feelings.

The development of the image of Hungary and Hungarians in Europe was thus an inclusive and an exclusive process at the same time. When people tried to define their place as a community in Europe, other people and geographical entities could serve as an including criterion, to express their bonds with them by stressing what they had in common. Still, these people and countries could also function as an excluding criterion for those who wanted to distinguish themselves from the world outside by stressing what separated them or made them different. It is therefore important to realise that the construction, development and spread of the image of lands and people could take place totally independent from the influence of the people or the country itself. Changes in image could take place completely autonomously, depending only on the political, social or religious dynamics of the actual community where the image was constructed. Images were constructed and altered most importantly in times of crisis or confrontation.

The construction of such an image is very much like the early modern way of presenting a political or religious message, often disguised in the form of a collection of commonplaces.<sup>9</sup> The original literal context of the commonplace is removed, and then it is added together with other similar quotes into a consistent text, reflecting the message of the new author. Similarly, a message could be composed by putting together a collection of historical examples which legitimated the political ideas of the author.<sup>10</sup> A good example is Justus Lipsius, who reused Hungarian stereotypes, quotes and historical examples for the composition of his works *Politica*,

---

<sup>9</sup> A. Moss, "The *Politica* of Justus Lipsius and the Commonplace-Book," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 59 (1998), 421–436.

<sup>10</sup> R. Bireley, *The Counter-Reformation Prince: Anti-Machiavellianism or Catholic Statecraft in Early Modern Europe* (Chapel Hill 1990), 72–100; J. Soll, "Introduction: The Uses of Historical Evidence in Early Modern Europe," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64 (2003), 149–150; id., *Publishing The Prince: History, Reading, and the Birth of Political Criticism* (Ann Arbor 2005), 22–23; A. Grafton, *What Was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge 2007).

*Admonites* and *Diva Virgo Hallensis*.<sup>11</sup> These works became exceptionally well known all over Europe. The best example of a Renaissance compilation concerning Hungary is the influential history of Hungary by the Italian humanist Antonio Bonfini (c. 1492).<sup>12</sup>

In the following section, I will list some of the topoi and stereotypes which have played an important role in the development of an image of Hungarians and Hungary in the early modern period.

### ***The Hungarian people and Hungary in Europe***

The concept of “Hungarians” was coined first in medieval Europe when the Magyar tribes invaded Christian Europe in the ninth century and permanently settled in the Carpathian Basin in the following century.<sup>13</sup> As barbarian invaders, the infidel Hungarians were seen as equal to the Huns

---

<sup>11</sup> J. Lipsius, *Politicorum sive Civilis doctrinae libri sex* (Leiden 1589); id., *Diva Virgo Hallensis* (Antwerp 1604); id., *Monita et exempla politica. Libri duo, qui virtutes et vitia principum spectant* (Antwerp 1605); Cf. J. Papy, “The Use of Medieval and Contemporary Sources in the History of Louvain of Justus Lipsius (1547–1606): the Lovanium (1605) as a Case of Humanist Historiography,” *Lias* 29 (2002), 45–62; J. Papy, “Justus Lipsius and Hungary: Exchange of Humanist Intellectual and Educational Programme,” in *Hercules Latinus: Acta colloquiorum minorum...*, ed. by L. Havas and E. Tegyei (Debrecen 2006), 171–179; M. Janssens, *Collecting Historical Examples for the Prince. Justus Lipsius’ Monita et exempla politica (1605) / Edition, Translation, Commentary and Introductory Study of an Early Modern Mirror-for-Princes* (PhD diss., Catholic University of Leuven, 2009). About Lipsius’ perception of Hungary, see also N. Mout, “‘Our People Are Dedicating Themselves to Mars rather than to Pallas.’ Justus Lipsius (1547–1606) and His Perception of Hungary according to His Correspondence,” in *Történetek a mélyföldről. Magyarország és Németalföld kapcsolata a kora újkorban*, ed. by R. Bozzay (Debrecen 2014), 398–442.

<sup>12</sup> A. Bonfini, *Rerum Ungaricarum decades tres* (Basel 1543). On Bonfini, see M. Birnbaum, *Humanists in a Shattered World: Croatian and Hungarian Latinity in the Sixteenth Century* (Columbus 1986), 14, 20, 46, 62–63. See also G. Almási, “Constructing the Wallach ‘Other’ in the Late Renaissance,” in *Whose Love of Which Country*, 92.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. C. Macartney, *The Magyars in the Ninth Century* (Cambridge 1930); id., *The Medieval Hungarian Historians: A Critical and Analytical Guide* (London 1953); id., *Studies on Early Hungarian and Pontic History*, ed. by L. Czigány and L. Péter (Aldershot 1999); P. Engel, *The Realm of St. Stephen: A History of Medieval Hungary, 895–1526*, trans. by T. Pálófalvi, ed. by A. Ayton (London 2001), 1–49; N. Berend, “How Many Medieval Europes? The ‘Pagans’ of Hungary and Regional Diversity in Christendom,” in *The Medieval World*, ed. by P. Linehan and J. L. Nelson (London 2013), 77–92.

by medieval Europeans, hence their country was called *Hungaria* (Hungary). The Hungarian people occupied parts of the former Roman province of Pannonia, therefore this name was also used to denote people coming from Hungary.<sup>14</sup> The image of the Hungarians, associated with the people who inhabit the territory of Hungary, was consolidated into the Kingdom of Hungary as an objective geographical and political entity around 1000. At that time, the first king, Stephen I, from the native Árpád dynasty, was crowned and the Hungarian people were Christianised by his order. Hungary and the Hungarians joined the ranks of the Christian kingdoms of Europe, together forming Christian Europe.<sup>15</sup> The perception of Hungary and the Hungarian people was thus integrated in the concept of Europe. Notwithstanding, the alleged Hun-Hungarian descent continued to play a significant role in the descriptions and self-representations of Hungarians in Europe.<sup>16</sup>

### *Hungarian Saints*

The medieval image of Hungary and the Hungarians was quite positive and popular due to the active promotion of the cult of the canonized members of the native Árpád dynasty from the eleventh century onwards. Texts, images, statues and songs of Saint Stephen I, Saint Emmerich, Saint Ladislaus and, most of all, of Saint Elisabeth of Thuringia/Hungary could be found all over Europe.<sup>17</sup> Another stimulus was the Fifth Crusade (1213–1221), which was led by the Hungarian King Andrew II (1205–1235). The Hungarians were presented as positive role models for rulers and ordinary people and thus played a role in the everyday religious culture of many peoples in Europe. The use of this image has continued on in the Catholic culture of Europe from the Middle Ages until our time.

---

<sup>14</sup> F. Banfi, “‘Imago Hungariae....’ nella cartografia italiana del Rinascimento...,” *Biblioteca dell’Accademia d’Ungheria in Roma*, new ser., 11 (Rome 1947), 409; T. Klaniczay, “Die Benennungen ‘Hungaria’ und ‘Pannonia’ als Mittel der Identitätssuche der Ungarn,” in *Antike Rezeption und nationale Identität in der Renaissance: Insbesondere in Deutschland und in Ungarn*, ed. by T. Klaniczay et al. (Budapest 1993), 83–110.

<sup>15</sup> See also M. Wintle, *The Image of Europe* (Cambridge 2009).

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 1–15; J. Szűcs, “Theoretical Elements in Master Simon of Kéza’s *Gesta Hungarorum* (1282–1285),” in S. de Kéza, *Gesta Hungarorum*, trans. and ed. by L. Veszprémy and F. Schaer (Budapest 1999), xxix–cii.

<sup>17</sup> G. Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses: Dynastic Cults in Medieval Central Europe*, trans. by É. Pálmai (Cambridge 2002).

## ***King Matthias Corvinus and the Hungarian Renaissance***

Beyond this, the history of the Hungarian people, their kingdom and its rulers gave much to ponder about in Europe. Political turmoil, religious developments and the characteristics of this often exotic country and its rich culture all served as building blocks of an image which could travel as far as Spain, Ireland or even Sweden. The person and the reign of the Renaissance King Matthias Corvinus (1458–1490) became legendary during the high days of the medieval Kingdom of Hungary due to the humanist culture at his court, his famous library and his patronage of art.<sup>18</sup> According to Peter Burke, Hungary was considered the centre of Europe in the late fifteenth century, in the sense of receiving the Renaissance earlier than elsewhere.<sup>19</sup>

### ***Propugnaculum christianitatis***

One of the most influential topoi related to Hungary and the Hungarians is the depiction of the kingdom and its inhabitants as the “bulwark of Christianity,” described with the term *propugnaculum christianitatis*. This topos was originally invented by humanists to describe the geographical position of Byzantium in Europe, but later it was extensively employed to describe the countries and the people on the frontiers of the Ottoman Empire at the eastern borders of Christian Europe.<sup>20</sup> This term was increasingly used in political discourse in Hungary and abroad after the advance of the Ottomans in South-Eastern Europe in the fifteenth century.<sup>21</sup> The concept, popular also in other borderlands of the Ottoman Empire, received a new meaning after the disastrous Battle of Mohács in 1526, when King Louis II died, and after the fall of the capital, Buda, in 1541. The country was split in three: it was divided between a leftover section of the former kingdom, ruled by the Habsburgs in the west and north, a part occupied by the Ot-

---

<sup>18</sup> J. Thurocz, *Chronicle of the Hungarians*, ed. and trans. by F. Mantello (Bloomington 1991); G. Martius, *De egregie, sapienter, iocose dictis ac factis regis Mathiae ad ducem Iohannem eius filium liber*, ed. by L. Juhász (Leipzig 1934). On King Matthias, cf. A. Kubinyi, *Matthias Rex* (Budapest 2008).

<sup>19</sup> P. Burke, *The European Renaissance: Centres and Peripheries* (Oxford 1998), 12, 58–60.

<sup>20</sup> L. Hopp, “Les principes de l’antimurale et la conformitas dans la tradition hun-garo-polonaise avant Báthory,” *Acta Litteraria Academiae Scientiarum Hungarica* 31 (1989), 125–140.

<sup>21</sup> F. Szakály, “Phases of Turco-Hungarian Warfare before the Battle of Mohács,” *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 33 (1979), 65–111.



tomans in the south and the semi-autonomous Principality of Transylvania in the east. It was this western part of Hungary which was considered the bulwark of Christianity until 1699.

### *Fertilitas Pannoniae*

The old kingdom did persist in the European imagination as a vivid memory, not in the least because of the literary efforts of Hungarian humanists in exile, like Nicolaus Olahus in Brussels and Johannes Sambucus in Vienna.<sup>22</sup> We can read on the backsides of maps, in travel diaries and in other early modern descriptions the medieval stereotyping of Hungary as *fertilitas Pannoniae*. The kingdom was depicted as a country with natural wonders like a fertile soil, wondrous waters, a perfect climate and good food and wine.<sup>23</sup>



Fig. 1. J. Nel, *Das Ungerland an alle ehrliebende Teutschen wider den blutdürstigen Türcken* (1580)

<sup>22</sup> N. Olah, *Hungaria – Athila*, ed. by K. Eperjessy and L. Juhász (Budapest 1938). On Sambucus, see G. Almási, *The Uses of Humanism: Johannes Sambucus (1531–1584), Andreas Dudith (1533–1589), and the Republic of Letters in East Central Europe* (Leiden 2009)

<sup>23</sup> E.g. G. Werner, *De admirandis Hungariae acquis hypomnematon* (Basel 1549).

### *Querela Hungariae*

The western part of the divided Kingdom of Hungary remaining under Habsburg rule took over the symbolic role of the bastion of Christianity from the middle of the sixteenth century. The creation of the topos of *querela Hungariae* ("complaint of Hungary") around 1537 was a direct result of the division of Hungary.<sup>24</sup> The topos expressed, as a symbolic cry for help against the Ottoman menace, a personification of Hungary to rest of Christian Europe, especially Germany. As such, it combined the topoi of Hungary as the bulwark of Christianity and the representation of Hungary as a devastated country (*ruina Pannoniae*), which was the counter-image of fertile Hungary.<sup>25</sup> It functioned as an important topos in the so-called *Türkenliteratur*.<sup>26</sup> The image of divided Hungary received an important place in Catholic and Habsburg propaganda all over Europe in order to legitimate the financial support for the war against the Ottomans. Divided Hungary was used in Europe as an example to warn other states of a similar fate. One of the most impressive depictions of divided Hungary, made by Johann Nel in the work of Martinus Schrott, is her personification as a female who is cut into parts by figures representing Austria and the Ottoman Empire (fig. 1).<sup>27</sup> The country was not only split politically but was also heterogeneous from a religious, social, ethnic and regional point of view. It was especially its religious division between Catholics and Protestants which was used to warn the inhabitants of other countries of the perils of religious strife.

---

<sup>24</sup> The classic study on this topic is M. Imre, "*Magyarország panasza.*" *A Querela Hungariae toposz a XVI-XVII. század irodalomban* ["Complaint of Hungary." The *Querela Hungariae* topos in the literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth century] (Debrecen 1995).

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 9.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. J. J. Varga, "Europa und 'Die Vormauer des Christentums.' Die Entwicklungsgeschichte eines geflügelten Wortes," in *Europa und die Türken in der Renaissance*, ed. by B. Guthmüller and W. Kühlmann (Tübingen 2000), 55–64; J. Jankovics, "The Image of the Turks in Hungarian Renaissance Literature," in *ibid.*, 267–273, and the further studies in this volume.

<sup>27</sup> J. Nel, "Das Ungerland an alle ehrliebende Teutschen wider den blutdürstigen Türcken," in M. Schrott, *Wappenbuch des Heiligen Römischen Reichs, vnd allgemainer Christenheit in Europa, insonderheit des Teutschen Keyserthums...* (Munich 1580), 17bis v.–17ter r.

### *Hungarian heroes*

Of all the thousands of Hungarians who fought against the Ottomans and lost their lives in various battles, only a few became famous elsewhere in Europe. They were used as moral examples to be followed, symbolising bravery, but also played a role in the propaganda against the Ottoman menace.<sup>28</sup> The already mentioned King Louis II fits into this context. Other famous heroes were Miklós Zrínyi, Miklós Pálffy and George Baxa. The images of these heroes were used to illustrate the aforementioned topoi, like the bastion of Christianity or the complaint of Hungary. The already described woodcut of Nel contains a list of these fallen Hungarian heroes and their images. (fig. 1)

### *Hungarian rebels*

The territory of divided Hungary was the stage of several anti-Habsburg uprisings and armed insurrections between 1604 and 1711, with 1848 as the last one. The leaders of these rebellions and military campaigns became famous symbolic figures in the early modern propaganda and news exchange. They served either as role models for the enemies of the Habsburgs, or as negative stereotypes in the Catholic and Habsburg propaganda. In the seventeenth century, the most celebrated anti-Habsburg heroes were Stephen Bocskai, Gabriel Bethlen and Emmerich Thököly.

### *The papers of the volume*

The collection of essays in the present volume seeks to explore a limited and yet representative range of topics regarding the image of Hungary in different regions. An important point of our studies is to record the intra-regional circulation of ideas and discourses.

Nóra G. Etényi and Orsolya Lénárt both explore the Holy Roman Empire as an important bridge between divided Hungary and Western Europe through which information travelled west. The study of Etényi is about the detailed image of Hungary and its function in the public sphere of the political, economic and cultural centres of the Holy Roman Empire in the early modern period. She shows that the electoral courts and imperial diets were the places of representation for the Hungarian political elite and at

---

<sup>28</sup> G. Galavics, “Kössünk kardot az pogány ellen.” *Török háborúk és képzőművészet* [“Let us gird our swords against the heathen.” Turkish wars and art] (Budapest 1986), 11–24.

the same time the legal forms of diplomatic ways to spread and collect information on politics in relation to Hungary. Lénárt describes the spread and development of the *fertilitas Pannoniae* topos in German literature after the second Siege of Vienna in 1683. She focuses on the work of the author Eberhard Werner Happel, who devoted six volumes of *Der Ungarische Kriegs-Roman* (1685–1697) to events in Hungary between 1664 and 1687, and in the preface to each volume expressed his hope that the war would end with the glorious victory of Christian troops as soon as possible. Happel's work represents Hungary through the filter of German-language leaflets, newspapers and travelogues, thus the novel presents us with insights into the development—sometimes radical changes—of the early modern image of the Hungarians. The most radical change was the negative influence upon the image of Hungarians as a consequence of Emmerich Thököly's anti-Habsburg policies. The policy of the Transylvanian prince in relation to the Ottomans slowly overrode the old topos of *propugnaculum*.

The study of Szymon Brzeziński gives a critical overview of past research on the image of Hungary, Transylvania and their inhabitants in the neighbouring Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, supplemented with new sources and viewpoints. Brzeziński also discusses important topoi in this discourse, like the *propugnaculum*, the Polish-Hungarian tradition of *conformitas* and the notion of divided Hungary as an example to be avoided. Moreover, he draws attention to the function of the myth of King Stephen Báthory in the Polish-Lithuanian culture and gives an insight into stereotype-building mechanisms.

Tamás Kruppa analyses the image of Hungary and Hungarians in Italian public opinion during and after the Long Turkish War (1591/1593–1606). Certain topoi on Hungary played a similar role in Italy around 1593 as in Germany and Poland-Lithuania, portraying Hungarians as the defenders of Christianity against the Ottomans. Kruppa shows, however, that an important and influential shift occurred in Italian public opinion during the Bocskai Revolt (1604–1606). According to the opinion of the Italians, the Hungarians and Transylvanians betrayed the cause of Christianity because of their alliance with the Ottomans. This was when a negative stereotype of the Hungarians as uneducated and uncultured rebels and betrayers was born, which would determine the Hungarian image for centuries to come. Kruppa states that this image did not only change in Italy but in the rest of Europe as well, due to the Habsburg propaganda. Moreover, Kruppa claims that this negative stereotype was not only confined to the Catholic world but also spread beyond it.

The old Kingdom of Croatia, as a political entity with its own diet, still remained a part of the section of divided Hungary under Habsburg rule after 1541. The division of the medieval kingdom of Hungary-Croatia stimulated a process of self-identification and the increased self-awareness among the Croatian political and intellectual elite. The study of Iva Kurelac is devoted to the perception of the medieval Kingdom of Hungary in Croatian historiography (1500–1660). She studies the image which was formed in the historical works of some of the most important Croatian clergy and noblemen and the role this image played in constructing the political identity of the Croatian lands. According to her, the main goal of this image was to create a sense of unity among the Croatian elite and to defend their position against Venetian, Ottoman, Habsburg and Hungarian influence.

Klára Jakó studies the image of Hungary and the Hungarians in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Moldavian and Wallachian chronicles. The formation of this image in this region was completely different from the developments described above because of a cultural cleavage between Western and Eastern Europe. Although the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia bordered Transylvania and there were some contacts between the various courts and people, still there was a remarkable lack of narrative sources compared to Transylvania or elsewhere due to the fact that there were no court archives in Moldavia or Wallachia until the eighteenth century.

Finally, Kees Teszelszky and Orsolya Réthelyi study the changing image of Hungary and the Hungarians in the Low Countries. Although the Dutch Republic was far away from Hungary and Transylvania, a remarkable amount of information reached the Low Countries. Teszelszky shows that this information came through various channels to the Netherlands, not only through Germany, but even via the Ottoman Empire. Information on Hungary and Transylvania was collected by Dutch information brokers and spread to the rest of Europe. The image of the Hungarians which was constructed by these information brokers served in the first place Dutch or southern Dutch interests. Réthelyi shows that the image of Hungary was used quite often in Dutch theatrical dramas after the reconquest of Buda in 1683. Hungary was associated with questions of state and government, religion, succession and sovereignty in the public opinion of both the Republic and the southern Netherlands. The historical situations surrounding Hungary provided settings to explore ideas in the dramatic genre.

The collective impression of these geographically wide-ranging chapters demonstrates that while the concepts of Hungary and Transylvania were clearly rooted in a common European circulation of ideas, the local

political, religious and social conditions significantly modified the interplay of different components and topoi. The final results will likely remind one more of a kaleidoscope than a clear mirror.